BEING PORTUGUESE IN SPANISH

Purdue Studies in Romance Literatures

Editorial Board

Íñigo Sánchez Llama, Series Editor
Elena Coda
Paul B. Dixon
Patricia Hart
Deborah Houk Schocket
Gwen Kirkpatrick
Allen G. Wood

Howard Mancing, Consulting Editor
Floyd Merrell, Consulting Editor
Joyce L. Detzner, Production Editor

Associate Editors

French
Jeanette Beer
Paul Benhamou
Willard Bohn
Thomas Broden
Gerard J. Brault
Mary Ann Caws
Glyn P. Norton
Allan H. Pasco
Gerald Prince
Roseann Runte
Ursula Tidd

Italian
Fiora A. Bassanese
Peter Carravetta
Benjamin Lawton
Franco Masciandaro
Anthony Julian Tamburri

Luso-Brazilian
Fred M. Clark
Marta Peixoto
Ricardo da Silveira Lobo Sternberg

Spanish and Spanish American
Catherine Connor
Ivy A. Corfis
Frederick A. de Armas
Edward Friedman
Charles Ganelin
David T. Gies
Roberto González Echevarría
David K. Herzberger
Emily Hicks
Djelal Kadir
Amy Kaminsky
Lucille Kerr
Howard Mancing
Floyd Merrell
Alberto Moreiras
Randolph D. Pope
Elżbieta Skłodowska
Marcia Stephenson
Mario Valdés

PSRL volume 78

BEING PORTUGUESE IN SPANISH

Reimagining Early Modern Iberian Literature, 1580–1640

Jonathan William Wade

Purdue University Press
West Lafayette, Indiana

Copyright ©2020 by Purdue University. All rights reserved.

∞ The paper used in this book meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America
Template for interior design by Anita Noble;
template for cover by Heidi Branham.
Cover photo:
Totius Hispaniae Nova descriptio
by Henricus Hondius and Petrus Kaerius
Johanes Janssonius, Amsterdam, 1633
Instituto Geográfico Nacional, España
12-M-13 1633 CC-By 4.0 ign.es

Cataloging-in-Publication Data on file at the Library of Congress

Paperback ISBN: 978-1-55753-883-3
ePub ISBN: 978-1-55753-884-0
ePDF ISBN: 978-1-55753-885-7

For my girls … Em, Asha, and Lola

Contents

ix **Acknowledgments**

1 **Introduction**
Portuguese Pens, Spanish Words:
Remembering the Annexation

17 **Chapter One**
Portugalidade and the Nation:
Toward a Conceptual Framework

43 **Chapter Two**
Vicente, Camões, and Company:
Immortalizing Portugal through the Written Word

79 **Chapter Three**
Epitome of an Era: The Life and Writings
of Manuel de Faria e Sousa

- **82** Faria e Sousa and Criticism
- **95** Faria e Sousa as Literary Critic
- **117** Faria e Sousa as Historiographer

139 **Chapter Four**
Staging the Nation: Cordeiro, Azevedo,
and the Portuguese *Comedia*

175 **Chapter Five**
Anticipating and Remembering the Restoration:
Sousa de Macedo, Violante do Céu and Manuel de Melo

193 **Conclusion**
In Praise of the In-Between:
Reimagining Early Modern Iberian Literature

199 **Notes**

213 **Works Cited**

229 **Index**

Acknowledgments

You never reach the end of a journey such as this without many people to thank. The point of departure was a Portuguese Baroque class at Brigham Young University with Kit Lund fifteen years ago. In that course I was assigned to complete a project on António de Sousa de Macedo's *Flores de España, Excelencias de Portugal* (1631)—a first edition copy of which resides in the university's special collections. I remember marveling at the audacity within those pages. My interest in that text eventually sparked another conversation, wherein Kit introduced me to Manuel de Faria e Sousa. He told me something of Faria e Sousa's house arrest in Madrid and the fact that it was during that time that he completed his voluminous edition of *Os Lusíadas.* A semester later I worked on a production of Ângela de Azevedo's *El muerto disimulado* led by faculty mentors Dale Pratt and Valerie Hegstrom. What I could not have known at the time, but is plain to me now, is how influential that first year of graduate school would be. Not only did these authors quickly become the focus of my master's thesis, but eventually would motivate my first conference presentation, my first peer-reviewed article, and now my first book-length study. Special thanks to Dale and Valerie for their early influence as mentors and sustained influence as friends.

During my first semester at Vanderbilt University, I had occasion to sit down with Edward Friedman one afternoon to discuss my interest in the early modern Portuguese authors who wrote in Spanish. By then I had learned for myself that Ed was as kind and brilliant as everyone had said he was, so there was no question in my mind that Vandy was the right place for me. Ed was not only supportive of my research interests, but mapped out what my years at Vandy might look like, showing enthusiasm for my topic as if it were his own. He was a dream advisor and mentor then, and has become a cherished friend since. My years working with him and Earl Fitz helped me grow in my understanding of early modern Iberia and comparative methodologies. I never really had a name for what I was doing until I heard Earl say the words "comparative Iberian Studies" one day. I took to it without hesitation. I thank both Ed and Earl for the multitude of ways they have supported me over the years, and in particular for

modeling superlative scholarship, excellent teaching and mentoring, and a radical kindness that inspires and challenges me to this day.

Many individuals and institutions have supported me in different ways over the years. Summer Research Grants in 2006 and 2007 from the College of Arts and Science at Vanderbilt University helped to propel my work forward when it was still in its infancy. My fellowship with the Robert Penn Warren Center for the Humanities at Vanderbilt and my association with the other fellows and Mona Frederick was also decisive. Support from colleagues in the Department of World Languages and Cultures, deans from the School of Arts & Humanities, friends from the professional development collaborative on academic writing, and the generous support of Faculty Development at Meredith College has always kept my work moving forward. That support includes various scholarly productivity grants, a 2016–17 sabbatical, and the 2017–18 Pauline Davis Perry Award for research, publication and artistic achievement. I am also grateful to the Department of World Languages and Cultures at the University of Utah, where I was a visiting scholar during my sabbatical. I give thanks to the Association for Hispanic Classical Theater and the Society for Renaissance and Baroque Hispanic Poetry for consistently providing a welcoming and engaging environment for my research and ideas. I also wish to acknowledge the *Bulletin of the Comediantes* and *Miríada Hispánica* for publishing some of my earliest work on early modern Iberian Studies, and Joyce Detzner, production editor of Purdue Studies in Romance Literatures, for her immense help in preparing the manuscript for publication. Others provided help along the way by reading or listening to some version of this work, including Fred Williams, Carlos Jáuregui, Marshall Eakin, James Krause, Anna-Lisa Halling, David Wiseman, Christopher Lewis, Antón García-Fernández, Laura Vidler, Jason Yancey, and Jaime Cruz-Ortiz. I cannot think of anyone, however, who has shaped my academic life and this particular journey more than David Richter, whose friendship, mentoring, and overall generosity have made all the difference.

And finally, I wish to acknowledge my family: my dad for his lasting influence, my mom for her constant goodness, and both of them for their examples of teaching and learning; Rob, for

always being my champion at home and abroad; all my brothers for showing up for me in so many different ways; and my sisters for always seeing me in my best light. With marriage came another mom and dad—whose love and support is beyond measure—and five more sisters and a brother. Without naming everyone, I hope all of my brothers, sisters, nieces, and nephews know how fortunate I am to call them family. But above all there's you, Emily, and our girls: Asha and Lotus. Finishing this book was only ever possible because of you. Its completion is our collective victory. Thank you for always believing in me, for picking me up when the windmills knocked me down, for sometimes going with me and sometimes sending me on my way, and for always cultivating beauty and light.

Introduction

Portuguese Pens, Spanish Words

Remembering the Annexation

> "One can change one's language as one changes one's clothes, as circumstances may require."
>
> Leonard Forster[1]

The year 1580 stands out as one of the most significant in Iberian cultural history. It saw the deaths of Cardinal Henrique of Portugal and Luís de Camões, the birth of Francisco de Quevedo, Miguel de Cervantes's liberation from Algiers, the first Spanish translations of *Os Lusíadas*,[2] and the dawn of the Iberian Union. The landscape of early modern Iberian literature would look much different if any one of these events had not occurred. Camões's passing in June marked the end of one of the greatest periods of Portuguese letters and foreshadowed the loss of political autonomy resulting from the crisis of succession occasioned by Henrique's empty throne. It is difficult to overemphasize the importance of these two events and their influence on the construction of Portuguese identity thereafter. In the decades following his death, Camões became the North Star for a people trying to navigate their uncertain present by mapping onto their storied past.

In theory, very little was to change for Portugal under Hapsburg rule. It was in Tomar in 1581 that a deal was made between Felipe II of Spain and a number of Portuguese representatives: "Here the *Cortes* of Tomar acknowledged Philip as the 'legitimate' king of Portugal, but only after he had agreed to major concessions and signed an agreement" (Tengwall 449). This agreement was made official in 1582 through the validation of a *carta patente* which assured that, among other things, Portuguese would remain the official language and that Portugal would maintain control over its commerce and the administration of its colonies.[3] At least on paper, then, it was business as usual—a new king, yes,

but the same old kingdom. Looking at the actual paper coming off the presses, however, it is clear that Portugal was changing. As Tobias Brandenberger explains, this was a moment of great significance on the Peninsula: "Spain's annexation of Portugal and its incorporation into a new whole … marks a political turning point of considerable importance for Iberian history and culture" ("Literature" 595). The presence of three different Castilian-born queens at the Court in Lisbon during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries initiated a period in which Spanish would permeate the Portuguese literary landscape for the better part of two centuries. The control of Portugal by the Spanish crown beginning in 1580 only intensified the cultural Castilianization already sweeping across the Peninsula. The Portuguese, therefore, did not begin writing in Spanish in 1580 nor are they unique within Iberia, past or present, for choosing a language of expression other than their mother tongue. There was not much of a market for works written in Portuguese, but perhaps even more symptomatic of the decline of works in the Portuguese language was the absence of a Court and the patronage that had sustained the arts in Portugal for much of the sixteenth century. As a result of these factors and others, the frequency of Portuguese-authored works written in Spanish peaked in Iberia during the six decades of the Dual Monarchy.

The generation of Portuguese writers that emerged from the shadow cast by these events manifest a degree of self-consciousness in their writings both characteristic of and unique to the baroque literary mentality. This includes, but is not limited to, Manuel de Faria e Sousa, Jacinto Cordeiro, Ângela de Azevedo, António de Sousa de Macedo, Violanto do Céu, and Francisco Manuel de Melo—the primary authors of this study. Without specifically asking the question, many of their writings put forward a uniform answer as to what it means to be Portuguese. That they would be thus engaged is not nearly as surprising as the fact that, in general, their works cast Portugal in the same light. Within their writings we can locate the "union of volitions" that Onésimo Almeida signals as a fundamental aspect of national identity (*National* 14), and at the same time recognize in them an existence not easily reduced to a singular Peninsular identity. Overall, the unsettling of the Portuguese self-image that occurred during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries produced a nation-minded

generation of writers who applied their pens to the exploration, celebration, and restoration of the *patria*.

Similar to many other literary critics and historians over the centuries, Pilar Vázquez Cuesta characterizes the Dual Monarchy in terms of decline, so far as Portuguese literature is concerned: "No debe de sorprendernos el bajón que da la Cultura portuguesa durante los sesenta años de monarquía dual y los primeros tiempos de la Restauración si pensamos que mucha de la savia que en otras circunstancias habría servido para revitalizarla se emplea en enriquecer a la Cultura española" ("Lengua" 628). Did Portuguese literature really drop off as much as Vázquez Cuesta suggests in this passage? The answer to this question, of course, is a matter of perspective. If the category "Portuguese literature," only makes room for works written in the Portuguese language, then the Iberian Union indeed represents a severe drop off from Portugal's literary glories of the sixteenth century. Similarly, if "Spanish culture" necessarily includes all texts written on the Peninsula in Spanish regardless of authorship, then yes, the Portuguese contributed much to the literary glory of their neighbors. If, however, works written by Portuguese authors in Spanish, or vice versa, were integrated into the more fluid category of Iberian culture (rather than any specific national canon), we would see the annexation not as a time of artistic scarcity but as a period of plenty. Which is not to say that the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries produced a legitimate rival to either Gil Vicente or Luís de Camões—each of whom, lest we forget, wrote a significant amount in Spanish as well—but that does not mean that this period was as artistically bankrupt as some have suggested, and certainly not a "wasteland" as characterized by David Haberly (50).

Notwithstanding the various ways in which we might praise the Portuguese-authored works written in Spanish during the Iberian Union, traditionally both the Spanish and Portuguese literary traditions have been disinclined to allow these authors into their respective canons. Reluctance to add to an already daunting corpus of works left by Spain's Golden Age and a tendency to perpetuate the reductive readings of the past characterizes the Spanish view. As the story goes, while such texts may be in the Spanish language, they are by Portuguese authors and thus there is no room for them. The traditional Portuguese perspective, on

the other hand, dismisses these authors for their willingness to abandon their native tongue and homeland at a time of national crisis. This perceived disloyalty explains why the Portuguese literary canon has closed its doors—almost without exception—to seventeenth-century Portuguese-authored works written in Spanish. Edward Glaser describes the marginalization of these works from the Portuguese perspective: "Students of Portuguese culture tend to leave aside an author who willfully neglected to cultivate the national language at a moment when its very existence as a tool of artistic expression was at stake" (Introduction 5). Santiago Pérez Isasi elaborates further still:

> En el caso portugués, la exclusión nacionalista de elementos 'extraños' en el cuerpo del canon adquiere, particularmente, la forma de una defensa contra lo español, ya sea contra las influencias estilísticas del barroco gongorino, contra el dominio político-cultural ejercido por España durante la Monarquía Dual (1580–1640) o contra los propios autores portugueses que, en especial durante los siglos XVI y XVII, compusieron su obra total o parcialmente en castellano. ("Literaturas" 26)

To Pérez Isasi's point, casting Spain's influence on early modern Portuguese letters as a foreign invasion of sorts entirely misses the mark. It is an anachronistic reading that depends on a narrow view of language and literature that does not agree with early modern realities.

In focusing on multiple authors across several different genres, *Being Portuguese in Spanish* intends to revalue what Eugenio Asensio describes as "una generación víctima de injusto desdén" ("Autobiografía" 637). Pérez Isasi connects this injustice to a systemic problem: a critical, historiographic, and epistemological apparatus that projects strict categories of nation, language, and literature onto authors whose own texts and contexts do not comply ("Entre dos" 139). At the root of both the Hispanist and Lusist perspectives that would exclude early modern Portuguese literature written in Spanish is the idea that literary canons are inherently monolingual, a position Joan Ramon Resina challenges: "the multilingual and multinational geography of the Iberian peninsula requires us to put into question the monolingual foundation of national literatures and to rethink the nature of the interactions among producers and consumers of literature" (viii).

Drawing all-encompassing distinctions between the early modern Spanish and Portuguese literary traditions is a critical imposition that does not serve the time period in question nor those of us who study it.

More than any other issue, questions of allegiance (based on their language of composition and where they lived) are often at the root of campaigns waged against Portuguese authors of the annexation. As Asensio points out, those who would indict Portuguese authors on account of their choice to write in Spanish are misguided: "Indignarse por esta preferencia dada a un idioma extranjero es incurrir en un vicioso anacronismo. Nacionalidad y lengua no se ligaron con vínculos indisolubles hasta la época romántica" ("Fortuna" 311). That said, many Portuguese authors were self-conscious of their decision to write in Spanish, often addressing this concern in the prologue of their published works. It is very common, in fact, to read some form of apologetics in the opening sections of a Portuguese-authored work written in Spanish during the early modern period. The explanation goes something like this: whereas writing in Portuguese would be, in effect, preaching to the choir, writing in Spanish offers the possibility of a wider readership and a deeper impact. A larger audience could serve ideological as well as economic aspirations: "al principio porque estaba de moda en la Corte, más tarde porque era en Castilla en donde radicaban los centros de decisión que afectaban a su patria y la lengua de Castilla les ofrecía mayores posibilidades de promoción social y económica" (Vázquez Cuesta, "Lengua" 601). With a slightly more nationalist slant, the twentieth-century Portuguese critic Hernani Cidade offers his view of the phenomenon:

> Prefere-se o espanhol, porque *é fácil para todos*. Para comunicar ao Mundo a admiração das façanhas dos heróis portugueses, para mostrar a superioridade portuguesa nas várias competências da vida de acção como da vida de pensamento; ou apenas … para garantia da voga mundial, da perduração através dos séculos de uma grande criação artística, melhor seria—pensava-se—a universalidade europeia do español do que o âmbito confidencial do portugués. (60)
>
> Spanish is preferred, because it is easy for everyone. To communicate to the World admiration for the great deeds of Portuguese heroes, to show Portuguese superiority in the

> various contests of action and thought; or merely … the promise that a great artistic creation would matter in its time and in perpetuity, the European universality of Spanish would be better—it was believed—than the limited range of Portuguese.[4]

According to Cidade, Spanish was the better choice for Portuguese writers because it made it easier to communicate Portugal's achievements worldwide and establish her greatness in perpetuity. While his assessment aligns with much of what Portuguese authors of the Dual Monarchy wrote about their own choice to write in Spanish, the perspective remains incomplete. These authors were motivated by a multi-faceted rationale that included social, economic, historical, and cultural factors. Neither the loyalist nor the traitor, therefore, is an adequate descriptor for the Portuguese author's relationship to the Spanish language during the Dual Monarchy. Eugenio Asensio explains: "Hay en ciertos libros portugueses una simplificación sentimental de la época filipina que reparte los actores en vendidos y leales, héroes y traidores. Esta visión deforma, no sólo la perspectiva histórica, sino también la literaria" ("España" 108). While traditional criticism tends to one of two extremes, throughout this study I assert that their relationship to Spanish, like the authors themselves, is somewhere in between.

Even though the language of Portuguese annexation literature is important, it only addresses the surface of the text. The body of works of which I am concerned in this study has two constants: Portugal and Luís de Camões. They are motivated by the *patria*, and the model that they frequently cite is none other than Portugal's most celebrated poet (the fatherland and the figurative father of the land being one in the same). Even when Camões is not specifically named, his patriotic imprint is visible within the works of his seventeenth-century disciples. In some instances, the references to Portugal are obvious, while at other times more subtle, but Portugal is always there, described in virtually the same way every time. We see an example of this in *La entrada del Rey en Portugal* (1621), the first of many *comedias* written by the Portuguese dramatist Jacinto Cordeiro (1606–46). He succinctly states his purpose for writing in the play's prologue: "tenho de eternizar grandezas de minha pátria" ("I must immortalize the greatness of my homeland"). During the course of the play

he lays bare the virtues of his native soil, including Portugal's love, obedience, loyalty, grandeur, divine electness, and general superiority. These same characteristics recur over and over again in Portuguese literature during the Iberian Union.[5] Overall, it could be said that Portugal inspired these authors to pursue the impossible: to restore the Portuguese nation to its former glory; if it could not be done in reality, they could at least recreate Portugal's greatness in their writings.

It was Camões who captivated the Iberian world and beyond with perhaps the single most important Portuguese work ever written: *Os Lusíadas* (1572). When John de Oliveira e Silva describes the poem as "retrospective … reflecting more on the glories that once existed than on the present reality" ("Reinventing" 103), he also identifies one of the characteristics of Camões's writing that will motivate Portuguese authors of the Dual Monarchy, who will also emphasize the past (a past that now includes Camões) in their various compositions. Camões and his epic allowed the generation of Portuguese writers that followed to see the extent to which the pen could impact Portugal's image at home and abroad. These authors took inspiration from the life and writings of Camões—wherein they found the greatest expression of all things Portuguese—as they imagined and constructed their own identity. It should come as no surprise then that Camões's name would show up in so many works written at this time. The dozens of editions of *Os Lusíadas* that appeared in the decades following his death are a testament to the importance of his poem during the Iberian Union, which explains why Vanda Anastácio describes it as a "bandeira do autonomismo" ("Leituras" 102; "banner of autonomy").[6] In sum, the early modern Portuguese authors of the annexation that comprise this study adapted to the unique conditions of their time and place by dressing themselves in the language of the empire, finding purpose in the Portugal that was and the Portugal that could be, and looking to Camões as a model of how this could be done.

One way to imagine most criticism on Portuguese literature of the Iberian Union prior to the twenty-first century is to picture a dance between understatement and overstatement where each one thinks it is the lead. When it comes to this body of works, in fact, it is easy to fall into the trap of thinking there are only two sides. Hernani Cidade, for example, claims that there was

never a time of greater national pride (27), which is precisely why Glaser thinks the Spanish have generally shown little interest in these Lusocentric texts (Introduction 5).[7] No matter how one evaluates Portugal's literary output during the Dual Monarchy, the Portuguese nation was one of the most widespread topics of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Portuguese literature; a reality augmented, not stifled, by Spain's sixty-year rule (Cidade 50). In truth, Portugal—as a place, a past, and a people—pervades early modern Iberian literature from beginning to end. More recent scholarship has had some success confronting the reductive readings of yesteryear, but relatively little has been done to revise the overall narrative that has kept Portuguese literature of the Dual Monarchy in relative obscurity since the second half of the seventeenth century. Through a close reading of the texts written by many Portuguese authors during the Iberian Union and the unique context in which they lived, however, a different story emerges.

For more than a century there have been scholars committed to what we would now call Iberian Studies. In *A intercultura de Portugal e Espanha no passado e no futuro* (*Portugal and Spain's Interculture in the Past and in the Future*) published almost a century ago, Ricardo Jorge put forward the term *hispanología* as a way of defining something similar (an intercultural, interdisciplinary approach to Iberian literature) (46). Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcelos's preface to Jorge's study describes the scholar engaged in such criticism as a *hispanófila*:

> como quem, indagando e explorando, sempre, desde os inícios do seu labutar filológico, havia abraçado, com ardor e amor igual, *Portugal e Espanha*, estudando interessada as relações mútuas dos dois países … no decorrer dos séculos, mas tambem as diferenças da sua psique e as exteriorizações de ódios, ciumes e rivalidades, em que a fatalidade histórica os envolveu. (Prefácio xiv)

> someone who, inquiring and exploring from the beginning of their philological labors, had always embraced *Portugal and Spain* with the same enthusiasm and love, intently studying the mutual relations of the two countries … over the centuries, as well as their psychological differences and expressions of hatred, jealousy and rivalry, in which the fatality of history enveloped them.

While this model of reading and interpretation is not limited to the Dual Monarchy, early modern Spanish and Portuguese literature lends itself particularly well to comparative methodologies, as it was a time defined by linguistic, artistic, and political crossings. Early modern Iberia may very well be, in fact, the richest period of artistic cross-pollination the Peninsula has ever enjoyed. My choice to cast such exchanges in a positive light is intentional, as I believe that the blending of literary traditions ultimately enriched both the production and consumption of such works.

Neither Domingo García Peres's *Catálogo razonado, biográfico y bibliográfico de los autores portugueses que escribieron en castellano* (1890) nor any book-length study since clearly distinguishes between one Portuguese author who wrote in Spanish during the annexation and another. The scope of García Peres's work, in fact, is much larger, as he wanted to catalogue all of the Portuguese authors who wrote in Spanish through the late nineteenth century. This by no means lessens the value of the bibliographer's project; it simply invites future generations to discover additional ways to approach these authors and evaluate their various contributions. Unfortunately, however, literary critics and historians have homogenized these authors and their works for the better part of four centuries, casting most who wrote during the annexation as opportunists (and in some cases traitors) with little to offer by way of literary merit. In contrast, the present study maintains that during the Iberian Union a sub-set of Portuguese authors used their Spanish proficiency to construct and promote a national imaginary throughout and beyond the Iberian Peninsula. By distinguishing the present study from García Peres's late nineteenth-century work, I do not wish to distance myself from his outstanding contribution. His text is the most complete bibliography of Portuguese authors who wrote in Spanish currently available and a great point of departure for this and any other related study.

Edward Glaser, a major enthusiast of Peninsular approaches to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spanish and Portuguese literature, gave this assessment of early modern Iberian Studies as it stood in the mid-twentieth century: "No obstante la importancia de este campo de la investigación para mejor comprender ambas literaturas, ha despertado en conjunto escasa atención, quizá por la dificultad que ofrece localizar los textos necesarios"

(Introducción ix). By this Glaser does not mean to ignore the work of his predecessors but rather to emphasize that more needs to be done to recover this "importante rama de la investigación hispana" (xi). Clearly, as Glaser continues, there is a great need to "examinar más a fondo una faceta de la historia literaria peninsular desatendida por entero hasta hace poco tiempo" (xii). The good news is that accessibility to these texts has improved significantly over the past two decades, which explains in part why scholars have been paying more attention to this unique period of Iberian literature.[8]

Although the main purpose of *Being Portuguese in Spanish* is to advance a cohesive narrative related to Portuguese authors of the Iberian Union and their various writings in Spanish, it also means to fold into the broader field of Iberian Studies, defined by Santiago Pérez Isasi and Ângela Fernandes as "the methodological consideration of the Iberian Peninsula as a complex, multilingual cultural and literary system" (1). There is no question that Iberian Studies has taken off in the twenty-first century (Gimeno Ugalde 2; Pérez Isasi and Fernandes 3). The last decade alone has seen invaluable contributions to the field, including *A Comparative History of Literatures in the Iberian Peninsula* (2010), *Looking at Iberia* (2013), and *Iberian Modalities* (2013), among many other titles. In 2018, *Criticón* dedicated an entire issue to *Letras hispano-portuguesas de los siglos XVI y XVII*. Iberian Studies, however, has generally favored texts and contexts from the past two centuries. Esther Gimeno Ugalde explains: "en su configuración como nueva disciplina, a los Estudios Ibéricos, especialmente en su vertiente anglosajona, se les exige también un esfuerzo por superar el presentismo" (4). In a volume he edited at the turn of the century, José Miguel Martínez Torrejón put it this way: "l'absence d'une connaissance générale de ces textes est regrettable ainsi que la rareté d'études spécialisées, sans toutefois nier la valeur de celles qui ont été réalisées" (3; "the absence of a general knowledge of these texts is regrettable as is the scarcity of specialized studies, without however denying the value of those which have been realized"). There is no shortage of voices calling attention to the importance of Iberian Studies these days, with some even identifying the specific need to interpret the Dual Monarchy within the same polycentric frame (Gimeno Ugalde 4). Pursuing a generation of authors that has long occupied a space "entre dos tierras y

en tierra de nadie" (see Pérez Isasi's essay by the same name) will enhance our understanding of early modern Iberia and Iberian Studies in general.

My approach to Portuguese literature of the Iberian Union is not unlike Richard Helgerson's work on the Elizabethan writing of England in *Forms of Nationhood* (1992); a work defined by crossing boundaries and analyzing discursive forms (Helgerson 6). I have identified a number of works by Portuguese authors of the Dual Monarchy in an effort to shed light on the ways in which these authors used their proficiency in Spanish to promote Portugal within and without the greater Iberian world. Despite the inherent challenges of such a position, which I will detail in the first chapter, the texts produced by these authors represent an early form of national consciousness that merits greater attention. Just as Helgerson describes in his assessment of Elizabethan literature, the Portuguese authors I consider in this study—in spite of their many differences—share a common interest in the nation: "They did not know where either they or history were going. But they did have a firm grasp on the interests they served, and they sensed that identifying those interests with the nation and the nation with those interests would satisfy several needs at once" (11). Helgerson recognizes the layeredness of the texts in question and focuses on how wrapping their ideas in the rhetoric of the nation could serve many different ends. The same can be said of the Portuguese. Writing about Portugal in Spanish was not motivated by any one factor, but by a host of possibilities which I hope to lay bare from chapter to chapter. Thus, I am not trying to make the authors of this investigation one and the same on all accounts, but am trying to highlight one of the points at which they intersect: a common interest in celebrating their *patria.* Just as Portugal is the protagonist of so many of their texts, the Portuguese nation—rather than any one author or genre—is the protagonist of this study.

The first chapter, "*Portugalidade* and the Nation: A Conceptual Framework," establishes the historico-conceptual apparatus through which I frame my approach to Portuguese nationhood. Portugal does not easily fit into general theories of nation and nationalism, especially among constructivists who insist on the modernity of the nation. The Portuguese nation boasts a stable border as early as the twelfth century and a strong sense of

collective identity (what I will refer to as *portugalidade*) leading up to and following the maritime age of discovery. In order to reaffirm the national imaginary, early modern Portuguese texts repeatedly evoke a sense of collective identity through the invention and celebration of Portuguese history, language, geography, folklore, and other identifying characteristics, including *saudade*. Rather than ignore the ways in which general theories (e.g., Hobsbawm, Gellner, Anderson) challenge my understanding of the early modern nation, however, I will situate my conceptual framework in a way that allows them to work in concert with Portuguese historians (e.g., Magalhães Godinho, Mattoso, Lourenço, Albuquerque) and the early modern texts that occupy this study.

The second chapter, "Vicente, Camões, and Company: Immortalizing Portugal through the Written Word," looks closely at the two most important Portuguese authors of the sixteenth century and their influence on annexation authors. While Vicente was not the first Portuguese author to take up the language of Castile, his writings in Spanish were exceptional in both number and quality. Whether in Spanish, Portuguese, or another language, his works consistently exalt Portugal. Though the author of the well-known Portuguese tragedy *Castro* was in every way a lusophile, my focus on António Ferreira comes down to his strict views on the relationship between language and literature. Nobody left a more permanent mark on Portuguese authors of the Iberian Union than Luís de Camões, whose masterpiece, *Os Lusíadas* (1572), proved to be a powerful vehicle for nationalist expression. From the time of his death in 1580 through the end of the seventeenth century, virtually every Portuguese author had something to say about Camões and his influence on their writing and thinking. Overall, the purpose of this chapter is to emphasize the legacy of the nationally-interested literature that Vicente, Camões, and many others left for future generations to follow.

The third chapter, "The Epitome of an Era: The Life and Writings of Manuel de Faria e Sousa," questions the Castilianized view of the Portuguese historian, poet, and literary critic. The heart of Faria e Sousa's nationalism, and the central text of this chapter, is his commentary *Lusiadas de Luis de Camoens, principe de los poetas de España* (1639). My approach to this work consists of analyzing the numerous instances in the text where Faria e Sousa

manifests his nationalist character, including the significance of the title page; the geographic superiority of Lisbon and the Portuguese nation; the glorification of the Portuguese language; providentialism; the loyalty, bravery, mastery at sea, and other values of the people; and the repeated references to a collective identity. It is anticipated that this will demonstrate the underlying patriotic fervor guiding Faria e Sousa's corpus of works and reveal the mechanisms at work among other Portuguese authors who construct *portugalidade* in a similar way. Beyond the analysis of his commentary, Faria e Sousa's deeply patriotic approach to historiography will also factor into this chapter. In works such as *Epítome de las historias portuguesas*, he both perpetuates and enhances Portugal's glorious past, reminding the reader at every turn of his own Portuguese roots. Although predominantly dressed in Spanish, a careful analysis of his works reveals someone deeply committed to the Portugal of his own mind and making.

Nowhere did Portuguese national consciousness take center stage more than in early modern Iberian theater, the focus of chapter four, "Staging the Nation: Cordeiro, Azevedo, and the Portuguese *Comedia*." The nation becomes an increasingly important dramatic theme in Iberian theater during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, not to mention an effective form of mass media. Portuguese themes, language, and history, in particular, appear in numerous plays authored by both Spanish and Portuguese playwrights. Works about Portugal by Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina, and Pedro Calderón de la Barca alone number in at least the twenties. This chapter traces the roots of the nation-theme in Iberian theater from the works of Gil Vicente and Bartolomé de Torres Naharro onward. Despite the widespread participation of the Spanish in the dramatization of both Spanish and Portuguese themes, the majority of this chapter privileges the Portuguese playwrights Jacinto Cordeiro and Ângela de Azevedo, whose plays overflow with *portugalidade*. Cordeiro, for example, was both an accomplished craftsman of the *comedia* and a self-identified Portuguese poet-dramatist given to the praise of his *patria*, whose legacy he was committed to preserve. From beginning to end, his plays display this very objective. My analysis of Cordeiro's work focuses on two clear examples of nation-minded drama: *La entrada del Rey en Portugal* and *Los doze de Inglaterra*. Beyond Cordeiro's dramatic corpus, one of the most

stimulating instances of Portuguese national consciousness in early modern Iberian drama appears in Ângela de Azevedo's three *comedias*. A close reading and analysis of her plays showcase the unique way in which her dramatic works perform *portugalidade*. While Azevedo does not openly criticize the Spanish empire in her works, they clearly establish the preeminence and uniqueness of Portugal, highlighting, among other things, geographic and linguistic superiority. Whether it is where they go or what they say, Azevedo's characters regularly manifest the Portuguese character of their creator, openly affirming a place, a history, and a language that surpass all others.

The final chapter of this study, "Anticipating and Remembering the Restoration: Sousa de Macedo, Violante do Céu, and Manuel de Melo," considers some of the key works leading up to and following the restoration of Portuguese independence in 1640. Perhaps more than any other text written during the Dual Monarchy, António de Sousa de Macedo's *Flores de España, Excelencias de Portugal* (1631) stands out for the extremity of its nationalist sentiment and foreshadows the author's active role in the defense of Portuguese autonomy in the aftermath of the Restoration. Sousa de Macedo was not the only Portuguese author actively preserving and defending Portugal's newfound autonomy. In fact, as one might expect, a myriad of works highlight the events surrounding the Restoration and support Portugal's right to independence. This is evident among poets (e.g., Violante do Céu), playwrights (e.g., Manuel de Araujo de Castro), and many others. One of the most active and important voices of post-Restoration Portugal was that of Francisco Manuel de Melo (1608–66). Manuel de Melo's subversive portrayal of Spanish decadence in his account of Spain's conflict with Catalonia, among other writings, is a clear reminder that between his Spanish mother and his Portuguese father, Manuel de Melo ultimately identified with the nationality of the latter. Overall, this chapter looks at some of the unique ways in which Portuguese authors sustained nationalist discourse in a post-Restoration Portugal.

António de Sousa de Macedo's treatise, *Flores de España, Excelencias de Portugal* (1631), closes with a question borrowed from *Os Lusíadas.* He asks the reader whether it is better to be king of the entire world minus Portugal, or to rule over Portugal alone. After hundreds of pages of superlative praise for his native land,

the answer to this rhetorical question is self-evident. It could be said, in effect, that his reference to Camões is nothing more than a restatement of the thesis governing the entire work. But what, as twenty-first century readers, are we to understand from such an ostentatious proposition? Moreover, under what social, political, and historical conditions was such a question put forward in the first place? While Sousa de Macedo's answer is of interest, it is not nearly as consequential as the assertion inherent in his appeal to Camões. In a time before nations and nationalism—at least by modern standards—what are we supposed to make of the author's overt exaltation of Portugal?

During Spain's annexation of Portugal from 1580 to 1640, many Portuguese authors voiced something similar to what we find in *Flores de España*. Making sense of that voice, however, is not easy, regardless of what facile interpretations recycled over centuries may say. The writers considered in this study made their affection for Portugal known almost exclusively in the language of the empire. What does the free use of the Spanish and Portuguese languages tell us about these writers and the time in which they lived? Furthermore, annexation authors invoke a rhetoric of nation and nationalism well before the rise of the modern nation-state. They do this with a degree of self-consciousness that is difficult to define because it is attuned to a collectivity that transcends any one writer individually. Is this national consciousness? If so, what could that possibly mean in the context of early modernity? The words written in Spanish by the Portuguese during the Dual Monarchy offer a response to these questions by challenging readers to make sense of the wheres, whens, whys, and hows of its production. The fascinating intersection of identity, language, history, and politics found within these texts leads to further questions about this often misunderstood and historically neglected period of Iberian letters.